APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,468	10/31/2003	Karen J. Smiley	ABDT-0582/B030080	2775

23377	7590	04/19/2006

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR
1650 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 October 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 March 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/10/2004</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's application filed on October 31, 2006 has been reviewed.

2.   Claims 1-39 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 32 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for

failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the

claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the

claim(s) in independent form. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter. For instance, the content of these claims is limited to an abstract

idea or a compilation of data per se, and it does not constitute a statutory process, machine,

manufacture or composition of matter in which the statutory process must result in a physical

transformation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this
or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5.   Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Apfelbaum et al.

(Hereinafter "Apfbaum") WO 00/072145 A1

As to claim 1, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:

comparing the data representing test results to predetermined criteria for the test results to

determine whether the test results satisfy the predetermined criteria [comparing the determined

paths through the model and the requirement expressions, see the abstract; page 6, lines 14-25;

page 12, lines 10-24];

counting the number of the test results that do not satisfy the predetermined criteria [page

11, lines 12-22]; and

generating an indication that a predetermined quantity of the requirement expressions of a

model do not satisfy the predetermined criteria if at least the predetermined quantity of the

results do not satisfy the predetermined criteria [generating a report based on the evaluation

whether the determined paths through the model satisfy the requirement expressions, see the

abstract; page 12, lines 10-24].

As to claims 19, 38 and 27, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As to claim 2, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches storing the data representing test results in the database [page 20, lines 10-23; page 17, lines 1-27].

As to claim 3, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches storing the data representing test results in a plurality of tables in the database, each of the plurality of tables having the data representing test results for one particular type of test stored therein [page 17, lines 6-16].

As to claim 4, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches storing identifying data in the data base, the identifying data identifying at least one of a serial number, a design, and a design version of a particular one of the plurality of transformers from which a corresponding one of the data representing test results is obtained [page 17, lines 1-27; page 20, lines 10-23].

As to claim 5, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches that the predetermined criteria for the test results are stored in the database [inherent in the system, page 17, lines 17-27].

As to claim 6, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum

further teaches at least one of a minimum, a maximum, a range, and a set of discrete values [page

18, lines 8 to col. 20, lines 7].

As to claim 7, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum

further teaches the test results are results of acceptance testing [ab; 260-264 of fig. 13].

As to claim 9, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum

further teaches designating at least one of a design and a design version of the plurality of

transformers in another of the tables in the database [fig. 9,12].

As to claim 10, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum

further teaches determining whether the data representing test results is at least one of: (i) greater

than the minimum; (ii) less than the maximum; (iii) within the range; and (iv) substantially equal

to at least one of the predetermined discrete values [targets totaled 75%, page 19, lines 26-29].

As to claim 11, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum

further teaches that the test results are the results of at least one of the following tests: load loss;

no-load loss; impedance; transformation ratio; turn to turn faults; high potential; double induced;

impulse; heat run; sound level; short circuit; and tank pressure [ratio, page 15, lines 9 to col. 16,

lines 5].

As to claim 12, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches sending the indication that the predetermined quantity of the test results do not satisfy the predetermined criteria to a computing device [col. 11, lines 12-22].

As to claim 13, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches defining the database [page 17, lines 17-24].

As to claim 14, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches selecting the type of the test results included in the database [page 7, lines 4-15; page 20, lines 2-7].

As to claim 15, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches selecting the predetermined criteria [page 11, lines 12-13].

As to claim 16, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches the predetermined quantity of the test results is a predetermined numerical total of the test results that do not satisfy the predetermined criteria [col. 11, lines 12-22].

As to claim 17, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum further teaches that the predetermined quantity of the test results is a predetermined percentage of the test results that do not satisfy the predetermined criteria [page 15, lines 22 to page 16, lines 5; pages 18-19; 264 of fig. 13].

As to claim 18, Apfelbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Apfelbaum

further teaches selecting the predetermined criteria from the database based on at least one of

one of the transformer design and a version of the transformer design [page 1, lines 19-25].

As to claims 8, 20-35, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis

above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur.

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

    Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 14, 2005

THUY N. PARDO
PRIMARY EXAMINER